UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,877	04/04/2001	Takafumi Soramoto	P 280041 VN-0071US	1841
909 7590 01/16/2008 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP P.O. BOX 10500			EXAMINER	
			GARG, YOGESH C	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/824,877	SORAMOTO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Yogesh C. Garg	3625	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 28 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on ____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). <u>AMENDMENTS</u> 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below): (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _ 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other: ____.

Yogesh C Garg **Primary Examiner** Art Unit: 3625

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments filed on 12/28/2007 with regards to claim 37 do not reflect the limitations recited in claims 37 and 38. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a user on accessing the insurance providing portal server is authenticated and then he is provided an access to a member store web page wherein insurance is granted to the user by insurance providing portal site server for purchasing merchandise on the member store web page and the insurance company makes an insurance payment to the user when an accident or trouble occurs) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). With regards to claim 37, the recited limitations are directed to a portal site server's units only, that is compensation granting database, history database, URL rewriting unit and a compenation granting unit and such a computer server is disclosed in Bell as analyzed in the Final offcie action mailed on 10/31/2007, see below:

See at least Figs. 3 and 6 and col.4, lines 11-51. Bell shows a customer using an interface to access/hyperlink to a URL, that is a merchant loyalty site which offers benefits including insurance coverage to the customers and is connected to various other merchant [member store] servers. The loyalty web site which corresponds to the claimed compensation granting portal site server and the first URL employs a rewriting unit to rewrite the URL of a merchant server linked to it by Hyperlink protocol and transmits this merchant server website that is the URL of the merchant server to the customer when the customer clicks "I Accept "button "32", see Fig.3 and step "65" in Fig.6. Since there are a plurality of merchant/member servers connected to the loyalty site it would be inherent to store the URLs of the plurality of merchant/member servers in a storage space[corresponds to the claimed database configured to store the URL information of the member store] and the information on deals as what insurance coverage to be provided corresponding to a particular merchant[member store] in a storage space [corresponding to the claimed history database]. The loyalty web site in Bell also comprises a compensation-granting unit for granting compensations such as insurance coverage to the customers relating to a deal performed by the user on said web page having said second URL.

Regarding the other independent claim 38, its limitations are closely parallel to the limitations of claim 37 and therefore it is analyzed and rejected on the basis of same rationale as set forth for claim 37 above.

In view of the foregoing, the application is not on a condition for allowance.